APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,015	12/11/2001	Eric Anderson	10016145	2067

7590	08/10/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHIN, KYUNG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/015,015	ANDERSON, ERIC
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyung H. Shin	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 May 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responding to application papers filed 5/9/2005

2. Claims **1 - 35** are pending. Independent claims are **1, 22, 32**.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

3.1 Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose: " *... delimiting the piece of*

content into one or more portions at a source (emphasis added) ... " (REMARKS

Page 3, Line 18). The referenced prior art discloses the display of content

utilizing internet technology. Internet (i.e. HTTP) technology utilizes a server

that delimits and formats the different types of contents of a web page before

transmission to client (i.e. browser). The client follows pre-setup (i.e. HTML

delimiting) commands and procedures to parse and format the content for a

web page at the server (i.e. source) before transmission and display by a

browser.

HTML: Hypertext Markup Language. (see

URL: http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/TeachingLib/Guides/Internet/Glossary.html)

A standardized language of computer code, **imbedded in "source"**

documents behind all Web documents, containing the **textual content,**

images, links to other documents (and possibly other applications such as

sound or motion), and **formatting instructions** for display on the screen. When

you view a Web page, you are looking at the product of this code working

behind the scenes in conjunction with your browser. Browsers are programmed

to interpret HTML for display.

HTML often imbeds within it other programming languages and applications

such as SGML, XML, Javascript, CGI-script and more. It is possible to deliver or

access and execute virtually any program via the WWW.

You can see HTML in Netscape by selecting the View pop-down menu tab, then

"Document Source." If you download a document as "Source," the file will

contain HTML markup codes and can be viewed in Netscape and other

browsers.

3.2   Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose: " ... *looking up*

the identifier at the destination and, if the identifier is found, retrieving the

associated portion of content at the destination and, if the identifier is not found,

receiving the associated portion of content from the source ... " (REMARKS

Page 4, Lines 20-22). The preceding definition is analogous to a cache. By

definition, (see URL: http://www.answers.com/topic/cache) a cache is a

storage medium (i.e. disk or memory) utilized for rapid retrieval of information.

The cache utilizes identification information to identify current information within

the cache. If the identification information indicates the requested information is

in the cache (i.e. identifier is found), then the requested information is retrieved

from the cache (i.e. destination). If the identification information indicates the

requested information is not in the cache (i.e. identifier is not found), then the

requested information is retrieved from the server (i.e. information source).

A cache is a pool of entries. Each entry has a datum, which is a copy of the

datum in some backing store. Each entry also has a **tag, which specifies the**

identity of the datum in the backing store of which the entry is a copy. When

the cache client (a CPU, web browser, operating system) wishes to access a

datum presumably in the backing store, it first checks the cache. If an **entry** can

be **found with a tag matching that of the desired datum**, the datum in the

entry is used instead. This situation is known as a <u>cache hit</u>. So, for example, a

web browser program might check its local cache on disk to see if it has a local

copy of the contents of a web page at a particular URL. In this example, the

URL is the tag, and the contents of the web page is the datum. The percentage

of accesses that result in cache hits is known as the hit rate of the cache.

The alternative situation, when the cache is consulted and **found not to**

contain the desired datum, is known as a <u>cache miss</u>. The datum **fetched**

from the backing store during miss handling is usually inserted into the cache,

ready for the next access. If the cache has limited storage, it may have to eject

some other entry in order to make room. The heuristic used to select the entry

to eject is known as the replacement policy. One popular replacement policy,

<u>LRU</u>, replaces the least recently used entry.

3.3   Applicant argues that the secondary reference and primary reference

combination is not allowed due to an obviousness rejection and lack of

motivation under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the combination of Sequeira and Liu.

(REMARKS Page 5, Lines 2-3).

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary

reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference;

nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all

of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the

references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re

Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Furthermore, in response to

applicant's arguments against the reference individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where rejections are based

on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871

(CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir.

1986).

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-35 is proper and maintained herein.

Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 103

The text of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4.   Claims 1 - 4, 8 - 22, 24, 26 - 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sequeira (US Patent No. 6,620,205) in view of Liu (US Patent

No. 6,839,680).

Regarding Claims 1, 32, Sequeira discloses a method for content delivery, comprising:

a) requesting a piece of content; (see Sequeira col. 4, lines 33-36: user requests content from a web server)

b) delimiting the piece of content into one or more portions at a source; (see Sequeira col. 7, lines 21-27: content is divided (delimited) into partitions (portions))

c) associating an identifier with a selected one of the one or more portions of the content; (see Sequeira col. 8, lines 3-6: identifier attached to each partition (portion))

d) sending the identifier to a destination; (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifier transmitted to destination) and

e) Sequeira does not disclose utilization of cache techniques to manage data. However, Liu discloses looking up the identifier at the destination and, if the identifier is found, retrieving the associated portion of content at the destination and, if the identifier is not found, receiving the associated portion of content from the source. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques for data management, cache subsystem associates document (content) with categorization (identifiers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in

network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31: " ... *automatically categorize the*

documents ... categorization technique should be robust, accurate and maintainable ...

")

Regarding Claim 2, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein if the

identifier is not found, the method further comprises storing the identifier and the

associated portion of content at the destination. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45:

identifier and content transmitted and stored at destination)

Regarding Claims 3, 34, Sequeira discloses wherein storing the identifier and the

associated portion of the content at the destination. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45:

identifier and content transmitted to destination) Sequeira does not disclose a look-up

table at destination. However, Liu discloses the method according to claims 1, 33,

wherein further comprising a look-up table at the destination. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-

23: look-up table for content management utilizing cache techniques)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create

robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in

network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 4, Sequeira does not disclose the method according to claim 3,

wherein the look-up table memory comprises a content addressable memory (CAM). (see Liu col. 54, lines 2-11: cache subsystem associates document (content) with categorization (identifiers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create robust and accurate performance techniques for content distribution in a network. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 5, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising computing the identifier from data contents of the associated portion of content. (see Sequeira col. 7, lines 31-39; col. 8, lines 3-6: content information generated based on HTML data)

Regarding Claim 8, Sequeira discloses a content delivery system wherein the source sends the identifier. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifier sent to destination) However, Liu discloses the method according to claim 1, waits for an indication from the destination before sending the associated portion of content. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques, whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to utilize robust

and accurate performance techniques for content distribution in a network. (see Liu col.
3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 9, Sequeira discloses wherein the source sends identifier and
associated portion of content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifier and content
distributed to destination)   Sequeira does not disclose that if information is located in
cache then do not send information from database.   However, Liu discloses the method
according to claim 1, wherein if the identifier is found at the destination, the destination
interrupts sending of the associated portion of content. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23:
cache techniques, whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu.
One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to utilize robust
and accurate performance techniques for content distribution in a network. (see Liu col.
3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 10, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the
piece of content is a web page. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 36-38: content partitioned for
a web page)

Regarding Claim 11, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the
piece of content includes dynamic and static content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62:

content partition (portion) categorized as static or dynamic)

Regarding Claim 12, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 11, wherein said one or more portions include at least one portion consisting of static content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62: content partition (portion) categorized as static)

Regarding Claim 13, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 12, wherein said one or more portions include at least one portion containing mixed or dynamic content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62: content partition (portion) categorized as static and dynamic content partitions (portions))

Regarding Claim 14, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 13, further comprising assigning identifiers to each portion consisting of static content. (see Sequeira col. 8, lines 3-6: identifiers assigned to partitions (portions))

Regarding Claim 15, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said one or more portions are of fixed size. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 38-41: partitions (portions) sized (fixed size) to be completely displayed on monitor)

Regarding Claim 16, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said one or more portions are of variable size. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 38-41)

Regarding Claim 17, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said

delimiting is performed by comparing the piece of content to another piece of content

and determining which portions are common to both. (see Sequeira col. 7, lines 31-39:

web page partitioned (portions) based on HTML data contents)

Regarding Claim 18, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said

delimiting is performed based on features contained within the piece of content. (see

Sequeira col. 7, lines 31-39: content partitioning (delimited) based on content features

(animated graphics or dynamic))

Regarding Claim 19, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 18, said

features including white or blank space to be displayed. (see Sequeira col. 7, lines 31-

39: content partitioned based on content features)

Regarding Claim 20, Sequeira discloses at least one portion received from source (see

Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: partition (portion) retrieved from server (source))   Sequeira

does not disclose one portion retrieved from destination.   However, Liu discloses the

method according to claim 1, further comprising assembling the piece of content at the

destination from at least one portion retrieved at the destination. (see Liu col. 54, lines

15-23: cache techniques, search and retrieve content information from cache)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to utilize robust

and accurate performance techniques for content distribution in a network. (see Liu col.

3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 21, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 1, said sending

being via a wide area network. (see Sequeira col. 4, lines 20-26: Internet content

indicates interconnected network of LANs and WANs (wide area network) in a

internetwork)

Regarding Claim 22, Sequeira discloses an apparatus for delivery of content data

comprising:

   a) a source having a plurality stored pieces of content, the source for receiving

      requests for content, delimiting the pieces of content into portions and assigning

      identifiers to the portions of content; (see Sequeira col. 7, lines 21-27; col. 8,

      lines 3-6: content partitioned (portions) with identifiers) and

   b) Sequeira discloses a destination coupled to the source via a network (see

      Sequeira col. 4, lines 20-26: network connected server (source)), the destination

      for providing the requests for content (see Sequeira col. 4, lines 33-36: server

      receives requests for content), receiving the identifiers from the source in

      response to the requests (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifiers sent from

      source to destination) Sequeira does not disclose a look-up table. However,

      Liu discloses wherein looking up the identifiers in a look-up table at the

destination, and wherein when an identifier is found in the table, the destination

retrieves an associated portion of content from the table and when the identifier

is not found in the table, the destination receives the associated portion of

content from the source via the network. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache

techniques, whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create

robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in

network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 26, Sequeira discloses the destination receives the associated

portion of content from the source. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: content retrieved

from source) However, Liu discloses the apparatus according to claim 22 wherein the

destination stores the identifier and the associated portion of content in the table. (see

Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques utilized, identifier is stored in a cache table for

data management)

Regarding Claim 27, Sequeira discloses the method wherein the source sends the

identifier. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifier sent to destination) Sequeira

does not disclose determining whether content is within cache. However, Liu discloses

the method according to claim 22, wherein the source waits for an indication from the

destination before sending the associated portion of content. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques, whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 28 Sequeira discloses wherein the source sends the identifier and the associated portion of content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 40-45: identifier and content sent to destination)   However, Liu discloses the method according to claim 22, if the identifier is found at the destination, the destination interrupts sending of the associated portion of content. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques, whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 29, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 22, wherein the source attempts to delimit the portions into those which consist of static content and

those which contain dynamic or mixed content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62:

content partitioned (portions) into static and dynamic content)

Regarding Claim 30, Sequeira discloses the apparatus according to claim 29, wherein

the source attempts to delimit the portions into those which consist of static content and

those which contain dynamic or mixed content by comparing pieces of content to each

other and determining which portions are common. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62:

content partitioned (portions) into static and dynamic content)

Regarding Claim 31, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 29, wherein

the source attempts to delimit the portions into those which consist of static content and

those which contain dynamic or mixed content based on features contained within the

piece of content. (see Sequeira col. 6, lines 57-62: content partitioned (portions) into

static and dynamic content based on features)

Regarding Claim 33, Sequeira discloses wherein said determining comprising looking

up the identifier at the source. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 16-22: partition (portion)

identifier table) Sequeira does not disclose wherein if identifier is not found, content

portion is sent to destination.   However, Liu discloses the method according to claim

32, wherein if the identifier is not found at the source, the method further comprising

sending the portion to the destination. (see Liu col. 54, lines 15-23: cache techniques,

whether content is in cache determines if content is sent)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize cache technology as taught by Liu.

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to employ Liu in order to create

robust, accurate and maintainable performance techniques for content distribution in

network communications. (see Liu col. 3, lines 29-31)

Regarding Claim 35, Sequeira discloses the method according to claim 33, further

comprising storing the identifier in a table at the source. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 16-

22: identifier stored in table)

5. **Claims 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Sequeira-Liu and further in view of Marconcini (US Patent No. 6,834,110).

Regarding Claim 6, Sequeira discloses usage of hash algorithm to generate hash

values. (see Sequeira col. 11, lines 40-43: hash techniques utilized)   Sequeira does

not disclose the usage of MD-5 algorithm in hash generation.   However, Marconcini

discloses the method according to claim 5, wherein the identifier is a MD-5 hash value.

(see Marconcini col. 17, lines 1-4; col. 17, lines 10-12: MD-5 hash generation)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to generate a hash value utilizing the MD-5

hash algorithm as taught by Marconcini. One of ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to employ Marconcini in order to optimize secure delivery of content over

communications network. (see Marconcini col. 1, lines 12-18;: " ... *a system and*

related tools for the secure delivery and rights management of digital assets, such as

print media, films, games, and music over global communications networks such as the

Internet ... cable or satellite digital broadcast networks ... " ; col. 1, 55-57: *" ... a*

secure, global distribution system for digital content that protects the rights of content

owners ... ")

Regarding Claim 7, Sequeira discloses usage of hash algorithm to generate hash

values. (see Sequeira col. 11, lines 40-43: hash techniques utilized)   Sequeira does

not disclose the usage of SHA-1 algorithm to generate a hash value.   However,

Marconcini discloses the method according to claim 6, wherein the identifier is a SHA-1

hash value. (see Marconcini col. 17, lines 1-4; col. 17, lines 10-12: SHA-1 hash

generation)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to generate a hash value utilizing the MD-5

hash algorithm as taught by Marconcini. One of ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to employ Marconcini in order to optimize secure delivery of content over

communications network. (see Marconcini col. 1, lines 12-18; col. 1, 55-57)

6.   Claims 23, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Sequeira-Liu and further in view of Grove et al. (US Patent No. 6,820,133).

Regarding Claim 23, Sequeira discloses a server for storing the pieces of content and

delimiting portions of the pieces of content. (see Sequeira col. 9, lines 16-22: identifier

and content stored in table) Sequeira does not disclose a far proxy server. However,

Grove discloses the apparatus according to claim 22, wherein the source is a far proxy.

(see Grove col. 5, lines 57-62; col. 12, lines 51-54: proxy server located at a not close

(far) location)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize a proxy server located near the server

(source) system as taught by Grove. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated

to employ Grove in order to optimize and improve communications performance over a

communications network. (see Grove col. 4, lines 57-62: " ... *improving the*

performance of Internet communication, particularly communication between web

clients and web servers ... ")

Regarding Claim 24, Sequeira discloses the apparatus according to claim 23, wherein

the server comprises a web server. (see Sequeira col. 4, lines 20-26: web server

utilized for content management)

Regarding Claim 25, Sequeira discloses the destination comprising a recipient of

content and for looking up identifiers received from the source in the table (see

Sequeira col. 9, lines 16-22: identifier and content stored in table) Sequeira does not

disclose a near proxy server. However, Grove discloses the apparatus according to

claim 22, wherein the source is a near proxy. (see Grove col. 5, lines 57-62; col. 12,

lines 51-54: proxy server located at a close (near) location)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Sequeira to utilize a proxy server located near the server

(source) system as taught by Grove. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated

to employ Grove in order to optimize and improve communications performance over a

communications network. (see Grove col. 4, lines 57-62)

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kyung H. Shin whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KHS
Kyung H Shin
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143

8/5/2005
KHS

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100